

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER

AND EASTERN CHRONICLE.

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR,
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY P. SHELDON.....WILLIAM A. DREW, EDITOR.

TWO DOLL. & FIFTY CTS.
IF NOT PAID IN ADVANCE.

VOL. VIII.]

GARDINER, ME. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1828.

[NEW SERIES, VOL. 2.—No. 49.]

THE INTELLIGENCER.

BALFOUR'S REPLY TO ALL N.

We are glad Mr. Balfour has taken it upon him to reply to Dr. Allen's attack on his writings,—and more especially so, as he has so successfully vindicated his own sentiments, and shown the error, not to say the ignorance, of his antagonist, on the subject in question. We make below some extracts from his Reply. They are not such, we confess, as to give the reader a full knowledge of Mr. Balfour's arguments; the whole pamphlet, which contains seventy-two pages, should be read, would the reader see how he follows Dr. Allen up, and refutes every position he has laid down. By the first quotation, which commences the Reply, it will be seen in what light Mr. Balfour views the subject, and in what manner he lays out his work.

"REV. DR. ALLEN,

Sir,—Through the kindness of a friend I have been furnished with a copy of your Lecture. I find you avoid naming me in it, but it is obvious my writings are exclusively the subject of your animadversions, particularly my First Inquiry and Essays.

A publication against universal salvation, and in defence of endless hell torments, first delivered before your students, and published by their request, might be expected as no ordinary performance. One would conclude, *a priori*, that the subject would be treated with the ability of a scholar, the candor of a gentleman, and in the spirit of a Christian. Your elevated station and titles; your general literature; your acquaintance with the original languages of Scripture; thorough knowledge of theological subjects; vast fund of biblical criticism,—all warrant the public to expect that universal salvation must now be refuted, and eternal hell torments established. It would almost be sinful to doubt, that such light must now be shed on the subject, that *stupidity* itself can no longer resist the evidence. With some such impressions, I hailed the announcement of your publication, presuming, if I was in an error, I should now see where it lay, and renounce it. But I am entirely disappointed. In fact I am sorry for your own sake, and the honor of Bowdoin College, that you have risked such a production from the press. But, without further preface or apology, I shall proceed to examine it.

I agree with you in your first sentence, that "the subject of discussion at this time must be deemed of the utmost importance by all." No subject, sir, in my apprehension, can exceed it in importance. You state it thus: "the question for consideration is—what is the teaching of Scripture concerning future punishment? Does it make known the doctrine of the future infliction of evil upon the wicked? And does it represent, that their punishment will be perpetual?" If you meant to answer my First Inquiry, you ought rather to have said, "the question for consideration is—what do the Scriptures teach concerning sheol, hades, tartarus, and gehenna? Do these words teach a place of *endless punishment* for the wicked as has long been believed?" It is not exactly fair in you to shift or alter the question in debate, as you meant to attack my First Inquiry. All my readers know, that book was written not to deny the doctrine of future punishment, but to show that the passages in which those four words are used do not teach it. But I am not fastidious about this, for if you can prove *everlasting punishment* from any part of the Bible I am ready to believe it. I shall therefore adopt your own words; we are then "simply to inquire concerning the fact of punishment; for by all, who assent to the divine authority of the Bible, what is there taught will be regarded as coming from the God of truth and therefore as decisive." Unquestionably. But when you add—"we are not now to speculate on this subject," I hope you did not mean that your sense of Scripture must be received implicitly without investigation. If you did not mean this, your mere *ipse dixit* decides what is truth, and the controversy is ended.

I perceive, p. 3, that you waive all consideration of the doctrine of *endless punishment*, so far as it bears "on the goodness, and mercy, and justice of God, on the order of his kingdom, or the interests of the universe." I commend your prudence; for you might find it a perplexing task to reconcile your doctrine of endless punishment with these things. But let this be waived, for I wish to accommodate myself to you in all things, consistent with a fair and honorable discussion of the question at issue. You shall be allowed to pursue your own course. The course you propose pursuing, is thus stated, p. 3. "I propose to examine a grand argument, on which much reliance has been placed, and shall then call your attention to various passages of Scripture which may settle your judgement." Were the minds of the students *unsettled* on the subject of future punishment? Be this as it may, I shall follow you in the course you have stated.

After commenting on Dr. A.'s attempt to

lessen the force of Mr. B.'s argument against the popular notion of hell's being a place of endless punishment, by calling it "a new discovery," which seems too important never to have been made before the present age; correcting some of Dr. A.'s misrepresentations of his doctrine, and examining what he has to say about the original meaning of the word *sheol*, Mr. Balfour proceeds to examine all Dr. A.'s texts and his comments thereon, by which he would support his statement that hell is a place for the future punishment of the wicked. The following is an examination of Dr. A.'s first proof texts and his remarks thereon.

"Your first proof text is Gen. xxxvii: 35. 'I will go down into sheol unto my son mourning.' When Jacob spoke this you say 'it is altogether probable that he had reference to the abode of departed spirits, where he hoped to meet his son.' But our translators, by using the word *grave* have excluded this important and interesting idea, and annihilated the strong hopes of paternal affection and enlightened piety." A more unfortunate statement never dropped from the pen of any writer. Let us look at it. You say, Jacob, by *sheol*, "had reference to the abode of departed spirits where he hoped to meet his son." Let us then inquire

1st. Was it the abode of departed *wicked spirits*? If it was, then it is certain that Joseph, his son, was there before him, for you say he hoped to meet him there. If this be the truth, Jacob had good reason to say, "I will go down into sheol unto my son mourning." But do you believe, that Jacob and Joseph went to a place of misery after death? As this will be universally denied, let us 2d, inquire, did Jacob mean that he would go down to sheol, the abode of the departed *good spirits*? This is your doctrine from the passage. But if this was Jacob's meaning, why did he say, "I will go down into sheol unto my son mourning?" He sought rather to have said—"I will go down into sheol unto my son rejoicing." He had good reason to rejoice, for first, he went from this evil world to a happy place, and to the society of good departed spirits. And second, there he should meet with his beloved son Joseph. Now sir, take your choice of either of these two views of your abode of departed spirits. One of them you must choose, for you have no other alternative left you by your own statements. You are here caught in a snare of your own making. I doubt if all the "eminent piety, and extensive learning, and diligent, prayerful, long continued study of the Scriptures," of which you speak, will ever make any discovery to deliver you out of it. But after all, it is only a probability, for you say—"it is altogether probable that he (Jacob) had reference to the abode of departed spirits." Your reasons for thinking this altogether probable you keep entirely to yourself. Notwithstanding all this, you say, "our translators by using the word *grave* have excluded this important and interesting idea, and annihilated the strong hopes of paternal affection and enlightened piety." It seems from this, that our paternal affections and partialities here, are to be carried with us into your abode of departed spirits. If this be true, I fear it will not be so happy a place as you imagine. I deeply regret seeing such notions of a future state, drop from a man of your character and standing.

But you add—"when Joseph said, Gen. i. 5, 'in my grave which I have digged, there shalt thou bury me;' the word *grave* is not *sheol*. But why should two different words be translated alike, unless it can be shown that their import is the same?" I might ask the same question respecting many other words. For example, why is *aión* & *kosmos* both rendered by the word *world*, unless it can be shown that their import is the same? Am I to blame for this? But who does not know, that *sheol* is spoken of in Scripture as "the house appointed for all the living." The *hebers* or *graves* were many, but only one *sheol* for all. All went to *sheol*; but it is not described as a place of happiness or misery for departed spirits, but as a place of ignorance and insensibility. And in direct contradiction of your local hell, Mr. Sabine, p. 86, says, "*sheol* in the Hebrew, *hades* in the Greek, and *pit*, *grave*, or *hell* in the English, do not describe to us any place or the circumstance of any location whatever." This is a bold stroke sir, for a man so orthodox as yourself.

I am sorry to see a gentleman of your professed talents, quote Isai. xiv. 9, in proof, that *sheol* means "the invisible state of the dead, the abode of departed spirits." Had you only quoted the next two verses, you must have seen your mistake. "All they shall speak and say unto thee, art thou also become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols: the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." Do you believe sir, that worms cover your departed spirits in the invisible state of the dead, whether righteous or wicked? Or do you believe, that departed spirits hold such con-

versations as are here mentioned? See preceding and following contexts. It is I believe, generally admitted, that the whole is an ironical figurative description, in reference to the king of Babylon. The dead are represented as moved at his coming among them, and insulting him with his degradation. The word *sheol* rendered *hell* in verse 9, is rendered *grave* in the margin, and is rendered *grave* in the text, verse 11. But I refer you to my First Inquiry, p. 27, where this and texts of a similar nature are noticed. Even on your own view of it, the passage does not intimate, that *sheol* is a place of misery, or that the king of Babylon or any others did, or ever would suffer misery there.

On page 6, you inform us, that "in Num. xiii. 20, 33, where our translators have used the word *pit*, Luther in his version, has employed the German word *hoelle*, as he has also in several instances, where we have the word *grave*. He makes Job also say, chap. xiv. 13, 'O that thou wouldst hide me in *hell*,' when certainly Job could not have intended the place of punishment as distinct from the general receptacle of the dead." You do not wish to send Job to hell, but still, you ought to inform us, how he could pray to God to be hid in your place of departed spirits. Also, why in the very next words he should add—"that thou wouldst keep me secret until thy wrath be past." What sir, had Job done, which made him ashamed to show himself among other departed good spirits, but prayed to God, that he would *hide* and *secrete* him in *sheol* or *hell*, the place of departed spirits, until the resurrection; for then he expected God's wrath to be past, as the context shows? Will you be so kind as to explain this on your view of the subject? I may add, is it of the least consequence, by what words Luther or any other man has translated the word *sheol*, after informing us as in p. 5, "if in any instance the word includes the idea of misery, and means the invisible state of the wicked in woe; yet this import must depend on other circumstances and not simply on the term *sheol*, which expresses only the unseen place of the departed." Your agreement page 3 was, "simply to inquire concerning the fact of punishment." Num. xvi. 30, 33, would have been most to your purpose, but perhaps you perceived, that when Korah and his company went down to *sheol* or *hell*, they went down alive there, and also all that *appertained* to them. I do not wonder then, that you was afraid to risk saying, that they went down to your place of departed spirits. I would merely add—a moment's reflection might have shown you, that Luther did not attach the same idea as you do to the word *hell*, or he would have rendered those passages differently.

In your next paragraph p. 6, 7, you admit the English word *hell* originally "expressed a covered place, or pit, or hole; more especially the grave." But as this would not answer your purpose, you add, "afterwards its import may have been extended, so as to denote the supposed repository of departed spirits, deep in the earth." It is not a *may be* but a *certainly* that it was so extended. The only question to settle is, was this extension of the word made by divine or human authority? But even this extension does not exactly answer your purpose, for you are obliged to add, "ultimately its meaning became more restricted, as in the present use of the word, to the abode of wicked spirits in misery." Well sir, the question to be settled is, who first gave this word its extension so as to denote the supposed repository of departed spirits, and afterwards restricted it to mean, "the abode of wicked spirits in misery." Was it God or man that did all this? You do not even pretend that this was done by God's authority, or you would not have added, "yet it seems to have obtained this latter meaning long before our present translation was made." In proof of this change of meaning of the word *hell*, you quote very different authority. Instead of the law and the prophets, you quote the homilies in queen Elizabeth's time; and instead of quoting Jesus Christ's authority, you quote the Ploughman's Complaint, written in the time of Edward III, nearly five hundred years ago; and in place of the apostles' authority, you quote an old legend of the year 1200, to prove that *hell* was used to denote a place of future punishment. And who ever questioned, that you could produce a host of such authorities? But is this God's authority for your sense of the word *hell*? You add, "at the time of our translation, then the import of the word *hell*, must be considered as settled; and the translators, it is probable, intended, whether right or wrong, to express by it always, the place of the wicked dead," except "in a few instances where they may have supposed that *sheol* was used figuratively." Very true, sir; but who was it that settled this to be the meaning of the word *hell*? Was it done by God or man? This was the question you ought to have settled, and I am certain you felt your inability to settle it by divine authority. If you did not, why beg the question at this rate, and only refer us to homilies, old legends, and similar authorities?

Mr. Sabine, though orthodox, differs very widely from you respecting our English word *hell*. He says, "It appears to me that in the time of this translation, *hell*, *pit*, and *grave* were synonymous, and alike considered as representing the invisible state, without one being more indicative of misery than the other." We shall see afterwards that very learned orthodox men are at total variance with you respecting *sheol*, *hades*, and our English word *hell*. By your own showing, sir, Luther, when he translated, did not intend by the word *hell* "always the place of the wicked dead."

You close your remarks on the word *sheol* thus. "That the word *sheol* most sometimes express the place of punishment, it is thought, is proved by the 9th Psalm: 'The wicked shall be turned into *hell*, and all the nations that forget God.' But probably the punishment expressed is cutting off from life, destroying from the earth, by some special judgement, and removing to the invisible place of the dead." This famous text, quoted so often by the preachers of hell torments, you then give up.—Every one sees however, how loath you are to part with it, for you risk the supposition, "in that place they may be further punished: but the torment itself does not seem to mean with certainty anything more than the state of the dead in their deep abode." But how do you know sir, that in that place "they may be further punished?" Was you ever there to see? We understood from you at the outset, that there was to be no *may be* in the case, but that you was to prove this from divine authority. But your attempt has proved a total failure; for the strongest text, reserved to the last, you admit is not to your purpose. What will your orthodox friends think of all this?—You tell them, that this favorite text of theirs, in proof of hell torments to the wicked, is not to the purpose, and that for ages good people have been grossly perverting it. In short you tell them, that *hell torments* was unknown under the Old Testament dispensation. I leave it for you to explain to them, how people in those days attempted to escape a punishment of which they were ignorant: or how any became religious and lived a holy life, without the fear of endless hell torments. It is well known, that in these days you cannot convert people without it. Hell torments is now the grand engine by which religious excitements are produced.

Thus Mr. Balfour goes through with the Lecture, leaving no important criticism, statement or proof text, unnoticed. Mr. B. has justly said in his "Notice to the Reader," that "it will confer a favor if he (Dr. A.) will point out a single instance in which I have misrepresented him, or pressed over in silence his arguments." The Reply is an able and candid production, calculated to instruct and edify the reader. But of the justice of this remark, none can judge correctly until he has read the whole work which we recommend to all who inquire for truth. We hope our friends generally will endeavor to provide themselves with the pamphlet and circulate it extensively.

EXTRACT.

[From a sermon by Rev. T. Fisk, of Philadelphia, published in the Gospel Preacher.]

TEXT. Can a woman forget her sucking child?—Isa. xlix. 15.

"What are the feelings of a mother, when for the first time she folds her feeble offspring in her arms! What unutterable thoughts come crowding thickly up, as she hushes its feeble cries! Tears of pleasure and hope, flow fast and freely, as she gazes upon the cherry lips, and sunny brow, of this first born bud of bliss, of life and love, wild with joy she feels the precious treasure all her own. And yet there are those who profess to be ministers of Jesus, who can look upon the fair, smooth forehead, of the slumbering infant, ere the world has breathed one sullying upon its sinless brow, and say, here is the abode of iniquity! Here slumbers one who is no more pure than the fends of darkness—here, perhaps, reposes a reprobate in the council of God, who will ere long lift up its eyes in that hideous blazing prison of hell, 'paved with the skulls of infants not a span long'!!!

Are ye men, or are ye demons, in human shape that ye thus strew blight and midew upon a mother's holiest joys? Are ye idiots and cannot feel, or are ye demons and have none but those of a fiend?

Can a woman forget her sucking child? Should the bright glow upon its cheek begin to fade, should the bright hopes that have sprung up spontaneously in her heart, be darkened by anxious solicitude, is her child forgotten then? when the tender blossom seems withering with disease, does the mother's love grow cold, and listless? Dear as life, and light, was her child when in health, and O how much dearer and more fondly prized is it when in sickness and in pain! Watchful days and sleepless nights, test the strength of a mother's everlasting love! Gradled in her

arms, she watches its every motion with feelings that a mother only knows.

But is it only here, in this vale of tears, that the mother cares for her little ones? Are these holy and tender charities, to be taken from her in the world to come, and feelings such as we ascribe to demons, substituted in their stead? If not, and God forbid, I ask what is Heaven to the *CHILDLESS mother*? If she is not allowed to cluster around her, in the world to come, those tender images which are engraved upon her very soul—I ask what is heaven to her but darkness and desolation!!!

I ask, and the question is as cruel as the grave, but the creeds of men collige me to put it—I ask if the mother, who while here on earth, cannot gaze upon the quivering lip of her child, but with feelings of distraction—if when she sees the filial gathering over its once bright blue eye, the deep dark shade pass over its brow—telling its last change has come, if unutterable grief fills the mother's heart to bursting, when called to part with her child, and that too but for a short season—what would be her feelings—what would be her agony and despair, if when called hence, she should learn, that her loved one, was snatched away from her warm and throbbing bosom, to be made a demon, in the abodes of darkness!!!

I ask you who are mothers, not what would be your feelings to learn that your poor wicked neighbor's children were to be roasted in a lake of fire without end—but what would they be to learn that your own flesh and blood, those who, while here on earth were as near and dear to you as your own souls—that seas of fire and clouds of smoke were the atmosphere which they breathed—that wherever they trod in this blazing prison molten lead was their footing, that they were continually sinking deeper, deeper, deeper—Ere, down the endless and sluggish ocean of eternal despair! would this give you joy?

O my God! is this the heaven we are to aspire after? Is this the place out of which Redeemer has gone to prepare? Are these the joys that flow at God's right hand?

No—we say no—God forbid! blessed be the name of our Father in Heaven, there are no *CHILDLESS mothers* in the paradise of God! There no scalding tears of bitterness will be shed, for those who were, and are not—grief and pain, have no abiding place in the mansions of the Eternal! There when the dispensation of the fullness of times shall have come, the great Shepherd will have drawn all his wandering sheep to himself—there he will gently lead his ransomed ones, beside the still waters of bliss—there he will fold the lambs in his arms, and carry them in his bosom. There the mother's prayers will be without trembling, and her thanksgivings no longer mingled with tears.

Fulfillment of Ancient Prophecy.

We perceive in one of the late English journals, a short paragraph in relation to the prophecies of Daniel, and it it should ever be verified, (and the difficulties in which the Porte is now involved seems to induce a belief that it will,) must effectually prevent, in future, all scepticism with regard to the authenticity of the Scriptures. It is stated that the ablest commentators on the prophecies of Daniel and St. John all agree that the Eastern or Mahomedan Apostasy would last from its establishment, 1260 years, and then its downfall and complete destruction commence. When Daniel wrote, it is said, the Jews and other nations reckoned only 360 days in one year; and the alteration in the calendar, making the year 365 days, did not take place till between 5 and 6 hundred years afterwards. Consequently Daniel must have meant 1260 years of 360 days each, inasmuch as he could have known no other. If this reasoning be correct, this year (1828) the prophecy is complete; for the Turkish date for this year is 1243. Now the Turks reckon their years of the same length as we do, 365 days. If we reduce 1243 years, of 365 days each, into years of 360 days each, we shall find that the Mahomedan religion has this year lasted 1260 years, with 95 days over.—*Virg. Genius of Lib.*

Disadvantages of a long Sermon.

A preacher had divided his sermon into thirty-two sections. One of his auditory rose immediately, and, being asked whether he was going, said, "To fetch my night-cap, for I foresee we shall pass the night here." In effect, the preacher, having lost the thread of his subdivisions, could never reach the end of his sermon. The whole auditory, losing patience, and seeing the night approach, filed off, one after the other. The preacher, who was short sighted, did not perceive this desertion, and continued to gesticulate in the pulpit, when a little singing boy, who remained alone, cried to him, "Sir, here are the keys of the church; when you have done, be so good as to lock the gate."

THE INTELLIGENCER.

SPEAKING THE TRUTH IN LOVE.—PAUL.

GARDINER, FRIDAY, DEC. 5.

EARLY RISING. "Don't—don't!" exclaimed Mr. P. one morning as his wife entered his chamber to call him to breakfast—"don't disturb me: I pray you leave the chamber—I am very sleepy—I have not got my nap out yet—go away, do!" "But, my dear, breakfast is all ready and waiting; the boarders are coming in; it is past eight o'clock, and I do wish you would arise." "Don't wait for me." "But your breakfast must be kept waiting for you,—and until that is out of the way it will be impossible for me to go about my daily work. I have been up these two hours, while you have been slumbering,—I have prepared a good meal for you, and do now come and partake of it with your wife and children. Besides, the store is not yet open—many people have called here and at the store to transact business with you; other merchants are behind their counters and no doubt take the business which it might be your privilege to do. You have already slept ten hours, and it is time you were up attending to your concerns." By this time Mr. P.'s nasal pipes gave evidence that he was again closely locked in the arms of Morpheus, and Mrs. P. retired.

In an hour or two Mr. P. came crawling down stairs, rubbing his eyes and complaining of a want of appetite. His faithful wife prepared him a wholesome breakfast; but he had little disposition to eat much. By the middle of the forenoon he was in his store. Business was dull—at least, dull to him, for purchasers were already engaged at his neighbors or had earlier obtained their supplies and returned. Mr. P. is a man for business when he is up and fairly awake. Honest in his dealings and accommodating in his manners, he is calculated to transact an extensive trade and to secure the friendship and confidence of his customers. But he suffers his love of sleep to steal away the best hours of business, and to disappoint those who otherwise would prefer to trade with him. A kinder, and more affectionate man in his family, or a more generally esteemed citizen of the place, does not live in H., but he has got into a habit—and these things go by habit more than any thing else—of "whiling away" his morning hours in sleep, greatly to the detriment of his business if not of his health. "Wife," said he one morning, as he got out of his bed, not knowing the time of day, and approached the chamber stairs—"wife, what's the time?" The good woman, pleased to hear the voice of her husband at so early an hour, in testimony of her gratitude ran to the clock, and returned with the answer, "half past seven." "Zounds!" said P. to himself—"no later than that? then I'll go to bed again," and softly stole into his chamber to consume two additional hours in unnecessary sleep!

It was a wise disposition of his time, which Frederick the Great made, in which he allotted eight of the twenty-four hours for sleep; but these hours should evidently be consumed in the night not in the day. The God of nature has wisely designed night for a season of rest, and day for activity. He who violates this disposition of time, sets at naught the wisdom of Him who made it. More than eight hours' sleep out of twenty-four is no doubt injurious. Intemperate sleeping impairs the powers of the body, as much as many other kinds of intemperance. Moderate rest is refreshing; immoderate, enervating and enfeebling.

When Dr. Franklin was in Paris, as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from this government to the Court of St. Cloud, he made and published an important discovery which arrested great attention, and which was indeed well calculated to prove immensely serviceable on the score of economy to the Parisians whom he found to be in the habit of sitting up very late at night and laying in bed the principal part of the next forenoon. And it was a discovery which may be valuable also to many persons in this country. Dr. Franklin, as every body knows, was remarkable for making great philosophical discoveries; and more remarkable still, for turning his discoveries to a practical account. Theory without practice to him was, like Calvinism—very lightly esteemed. In one of the evening papers of Paris he caused to be published an important discovery, to which he would invite the particular attention of all good Bourbon subjects. It ran in this wise: On awaking accidentally from sleep one morning about the hour of five o'clock, he was greatly astonished to find the room filled with a blaze of light far beyond what could be produced by the lamps with which he retired. On arising to ascertain the cause of this phenomenon, he was his surprise to find, as he looked of the window, that the sun had arisen, that he enlightened not only his chamber but the whole city, and probably every house in it whose rooms had not been made against any light but lamp light! For several mornings at the same hour he

repeated the same observations, and found that the same light was uniformly furnished the city. On being satisfied that his discovery was a true one, he announced the remarkable fact to the Parisians in an advertisement, accompanied by much sage reasoning and profound advice as to the course they might take in the saving of light, and of oil which was consumed in obtaining it. He assured them, that if they would extinguish their lamps at ten o'clock and go to bed, they might as well as not make a right out saving of the oil which they usually consumed for three or four hours after that time; and by rising at five or six o'clock, they would be astonished, as he was, to find the world enlightened by the great lamp of heaven, and would be able to prosecute their business or pleasures much more comfortably by the assistance of that light than by lamp light! His account finished by a calculation of the number of barrels of oil consumed in Paris after ten o'clock, and of the vast sum of money which might be saved by the city if its citizens would use sun light in preference to any artificial illumination.

By following Franklin's advice, not only much saving may be made in families, but the health of people would no doubt be improved, and their business more prosperous.

TRUTH IN A "NUT-SHELL." One of the three following statements must be true. Let the honest reader, who wants truth above every thing else, decide candidly which it is.

- I. God will save all men and cannot;—or
- II. He can save all men and will not;—or
- III. He can save all men and will save them.

Now one of these must be true—two of them, consequently, must be false. Let us see which it is. 1. If God will save all men and cannot, he is not almighty; for there is nothing which an almighty being cannot do. "Is any thing too hard for me, saith the Lord?" But God is omnipotent; therefore this statement cannot be true. Throw this away then. Let us take the second. 2. If God can save all men and will not; he is not impartial. But "the wisdom that is from above is without partiality." God is "no respecter of persons." He "is good to all." No truth is more evident, or universally admitted, than that God is not a partial being. This statement, then, cannot be true. We have found the two false statements then; and the one that is left must be the true one, viz. God can, and will save all men. He can save all men, because he is omnipotent; He will save all men, because he is impartial.—And, says Dr. Emmons, "was it ever known that a being had both the will and the power to do a thing and yet neglected to do it?"

It appears that Miss *Thankful Skinner*, of Woodstock, Ct. from whom, on her dying bed, G. M. Tracy begged \$1500,—the whole "fruit of her industry in the humble, but honest and useful occupation of seamstress," left her nearest relative, an affectionate sister, with eight fatherless children, so poor that she and they are obliged to labor for their daily bread in what is called Swamp Factory, Thompson, Conn. If, instead of giving this sum to Mr. Tracy, for missionary purposes, she had given it, or a good part of it, to her poor and deserving sister, to enable her to purchase a small farm and live comfortably in the world, she would have left behind her much better evidence of her piety and real religion than now exists. But these mendicants have no mercy for the poor widows and orphans; they seem willing to take the last morsel from their hungry mouths to help enrich their already over-loaded coffers.

PREACHER WANTED IN NORTH-CAROLINA.

The subscriber, from the health of his family, being under the necessity of relinquishing his engagements in North Carolina for the present, is requested by the friends of Universalism in Wilmington and vicinity, to procure some one to supply his place. A large field for labor has been opened in that quarter, and the prospects are flattering. Among a generous, hospitable, and kind hearted people as our country affords, a person adequate to the work, and willing to devote his time and talents to the glorious cause, will meet with such a reception, and such encouragement, as will be grateful to the feelings, and in all respects, satisfactory. To a young man, without a family, particularly, few opportunities occur, of becoming so useful in the cause of truth, or being so advantageously settled. The subscriber leaves the field with reluctance; nor would he do so, but from imperious necessity. He has labored there ardently and incessantly, during the greater part of three years past—under God, he has gathered a number of respectable societies, and organized a Convention of our order. He has done all his strength and abilities would enable him to do, to promote the cause, and to render the labors of his successors easy. The ground has been broken, the seed has been sown—it requires to be cultivated. Will some brother step forward and lend a helping hand to bring it to maturity and gather in the harvest, or leave the fruits to wither and die on the stalk?—Let not the cry of the destitute be heard in vain!

Any further information required, may be obtained by application to the subscriber, directed to Providence, R. I. and to which, immediate attention will be given. JACOB FRIEZE, North Providence, R. I. Nov. 20, 1828.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

LETTER NO. VIII.

DEAR W.—While writing my former letters* to you, I found abler pens than my own engaged in developing the machinery by which modern revivals were put in motion, and the arts and tricks which the abettors of a dark, gloomy philosophy, resorted to, in order to gain proselytes—or rather make victims. I therefore laid down my pen with pleasure, because I knew you would obtain more intelligence from others than from me. I beheld, with pain, an effort making to enslave the human mind, to introduce again the age of monkish superstition; to pervert the gospel of Jesus Christ, on which we can alone depend in the hour of affliction and trouble, for consolation and support, into an engine to appal and oppress the human mind and make it abject and slavish; to make it tremble at the sight of any bigot who wore a black coat and a long face.—The design and object of the gospel were, to bring peace on earth and good will to man; to elevate the soul to a glorious prospect of a happy immortality. It is therefore perverted when it makes men gloomy, morose and cruel. This is a false religion, for it neither works by love, nor purifies the heart. It does not soothe the soul in the day of adversity, nor animate to noble and virtuous action, nor place the affections on God as the chief good, nor learn us to trust in him and be at peace.

The active exertions of the friends of pure and undefiled religion, have done much towards staying the progress of superstition and error. There is much less noise now than there was one year ago. Even Mr. Beecher himself says but little, and in some points, it is said he is left *absque remedio*. The orthodox too have written down Finney and Beeman. As for the establishment of a national religion, which some mad fanatics so earnestly desire, even the orthodox people themselves would vote it down by great majorities. The good, sensible part of that order of men prize their liberties too highly to trust themselves in the hands of ignorant and daring fanatics, regardless of religion, of morals and of public virtue. There are many virtuous independent minds in that order, who despise the low means resorted to, to obtain money for the purpose of propagating sectarian doctrines and to make a pharisaical display of misguided zeal and self-righteousness; and they do it openly, manfully, like honest good men, who regard more the law of God and the cause of liberty of conscience and the rights of man, than the cause of bigotry in any form. If the friends of righteousness and truth do their duty, fearlessly advocate the right cause, and prove by their works, by their lives and conversation, the fruits of the faith they possess, there is nothing to fear. The late religious controversy has brought many superior minds to investigate the subject; and notwithstanding there have been much bitterness and wrath and evil speaking, great good will ensue from it. Impostors shrink from investigation, and seek out victims of ignorance and weakness to impose upon and deceive. I do not mean to say that bigotry is dead. I only mean that it is somewhat weakened by its own poison. There are some of undying energy, who lay in wait, in all directions, to deceive. Their weapons of war are, the flames of hell, the torments of the damned, the frowns of an angry God, the interminable duration of future misery; these, connected with some flying squads of witch-stories, and ghost-stories, and a countenance shaded with gloom and despair, make their principal weapons of attack. Thus armed they enter our houses when they suppose the natural guardian of the family is absent, and make their attacks on females and children. The first thing is to terrify them, give them the horrors, and make what they call an "impression;" if by any ingenuity and adroitness they can withdraw any sentence which they can plausibly construe to meet their views, they apply again with redoubled violence, claim all concessions before made, with their own comments, and chain the subject, like Prometheus to his rock, and set the whole pack of their vultures preying on the vitals. The bigot, having succeeded thus far, is generally sure of his victim; for he has driven reason from her throne, unhinged the divine order of the intellect, created an abject and mean spirit, which dares not think and reason for itself, prepared to follow its leader, right or wrong, with strict devotedness; never to read any book, or hear any minister, except approved by their master; never even to think, or know, or see any thing, except what the master approves; attend night meetings, give the last cent to support missions, &c. and then hate and persecute every one who differs from them in opinion. This done, absorption is then given; the neophyte, changed, regenerated, born again into the doctrines of the sect, is made heir of immortal glory, on condition of remaining steadfast in the faith, and of never being any wiser or any better. Such are the operations, and such the fruits of these men. But notwithstanding all efforts of this kind the progress made is small. The age for bigotry is passing away; darkness cannot, in the present progress of the human mind, again cover the nation. Affectionately, yours, D.

* The last will be found in No. 12 of the present volume, under date of March 21.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

FOREKNOWLEDGE AND FOREORDINATION.

MR. DREW, Sir,—As a sincere inquirer after truth, permit me to submit to yourself, or some of your correspondents, a question, which I am unable to answer in my own mind.

When we take into consideration the character of God, we find scripture, reason, and the works of his hand, united to testify that he is an infinite being, "in whom is no variableness, or shadow of turning." Now an infinite being is as infinite in one attribute as in another;—he must be infinite in mercy, and of course, an infinite number of his creatures must be equally and infinitely favored by him; and as all favors bestowed in this life, are limited, man must be favored by his Maker in another world, in order that the mercies extended to him may comport with the attribute of Deity, for "God is love," and testimony cannot, I think, be produced to prove that he is in substance, the reverse. God being infinite in knowledge, must have known from eternity every event that would transpire in this world during the period of its existence; this we cannot deny. He must have known that Adam would transgress his divine law. Now if he knew it for a certainty and created Adam under that knowledge, the event must have been precisely as he knew it would be. If he had only supposed that it would be the case, there would have been a possibility of its being otherwise; but as he knew it would be so, there must have been an unalterable decree to enforce the event, otherwise Deity could not have been in possession of that positive assurance. Under the consideration of these facts, I draw the conclusion, that God designed sin should enter the world! Can God be the author of sin for which he punishes man? "The way of the transgressor is hard." Who is the transgressor if all are doing God's will in the pursuit of the course designed for them before the creation? God has enacted laws for the regulation of man, which supposes an ability on the part of man, to violate or keep said laws as he may choose; but if an infinite being previously knew that man would violate his laws, and yet, under that knowledge, created man, the latter must and will violate them; and will not their violation accomplish the object of Deity? And if so, why punish man for the act? These things look dark indeed. On the one hand, every thing persuasive represents man as a machine, propelled by his Maker through all the courses which we term good and evil;—and on the other hand realities testify that man is a free-agent, capable of directing his own course of conduct. A man may murder his neighbor, or refrain from the deed, just as his inclination leads him; if he murders, he has committed the deed and violated the law, "thou shalt not kill;" and yet, before God created this man he knew, positively, that he would commit the murder, and created him under that knowledge,—reducing it to a certainty that he must commit the crime. As I asked before, is God the author of crime for which he punishes man? and yet man a free-agent? If you will reconcile the above, you will gratify a friend.

Yours, AN INQUIRER.

Gardiner, Nov. 1828.

REPLY.

Our Inquirer has presented a knotty question, which, though we know not as a solution of it would produce any practical benefit, thousands of ingenious polemics have attempted to untie and many, dissatisfied in the undertaking, have endeavored to cut. In the midst of so much learning as has been expended upon the subject and of such variant opinions among the learned as still exist concerning it, it does not become us, most certainly, to erect the standard of infallibility, and to proceed to solve the difficulty with a certainty of convincing others that we are correct. Still, as our friend has asked us a civil question, we will endeavor as civilly to answer him according to our views of the subject.

The difficulty, if we understand it, is, in reconciling the fact, that God foreknew that man would sin, with the other fact, (for none would deny its being such,) that He is not the author of sin. Our correspondent, if we rightly apprehend him, seems to think that God's foreknowing that Adam and his posterity would sin, is what made it certain that he would sin. Now we agree, that God could not have foreknown that Adam would sin, unless it was certain he would sin; still, we do not believe it so correct to say, that his foreknowledge is what rendered it certain that he would transgress, as to say, (if we may use popular language as applied to the omniscience of Deity,) that the certainty that Adam would sin is what enabled him to foreknow he would offend. In our opinion, foreknowledge and foreordination are not the same;—the former is an attribute, the latter an act or operation of the Divine Being.—Hence God may foreknow what may not have been foreordained. We cannot well illustrate this by an example; for omniscience is beyond our knowledge. Still, suppose it was possible for us to look, say ten years, into futurity. As we travelled through the circumstances of the intervening time, we might know that young Napoleon, will, at that time, be seated on the throne of France. Now our foreknowledge of this fact does not

create the fact. It is, or rather it will be, a fact, because circumstances, which will operate as freely as any others in the control of moral agency, will conspire to make it such. "But still," you will say, "it is now certain that young Napoleon will be seated on the throne of France. You could not have known it if it were not certain: what makes it certain?" The same that has made any event certain that transpires to-day; and if any action of our lives which takes place to-day result under the operation of our moral, free agency, so may that. So God, who is omniscient, may have been able to look through the *longo agmine*, the long extended train of future events, and have seen that Adam and each individual of his posterity, in the complete possession of moral freedom, would transgress; still, his foreknowledge of the fact imposes of itself no necessity thereupon. He may have known that a thing would exist that should demerit his righteous judgement, as well as any thing else, and the certainty of its existence may not lie in his foreordination, but rather in the circumstances which shall most freely transpire. We cannot agree, therefore, with "An Inquirer," that if "he knew it would be so, there must have been an unalterable decree to enforce the event."

We know it still may be said, that if God foreknew man would sin if he created him; and if he put him into being under a knowledge of this fact, he is responsible for its occurrence; and in this sense he may be said to be the author of sin. But on this subject we are lost. God could not have known that man would sin unless he knew he would exist—for the very reason that he could not transgress without existing; and his knowledge of the one was as necessary as his knowledge of the other. Under such knowledge it would indeed have been an unmerciful act in God to give being to any creature which he foreknew would be a final loser by his existence—who would, by sinning, incur an endless state of misery. But there is nothing unmerciful, as we conceive, in his giving existence to creatures, which, though he knew they would offend and be chastised for their transgressions, shall finally be eternal gainers by their having been created. In this view of the subject, seeing our light afflictions are made necessary to our future good, there is no occasion to murmur at the plan he has chosen to adopt in reference to his creatures.

But we all of us commit one capital mistake when reasoning on the foreknowledge of Deity. We are apt to make him altogether like ourselves. We are governed by circumstances of time, and suppose he is also.—When we speak of foreknowledge we suppose it is something that looks into futurity. Our knowledge is governed by the order of time and is progressive: it is not so with him.

"He fills his own eternal now,
And ever is his time."

Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as foreknowledge with the Deity. To him there is no future—no past—every thing from eternity to eternity is present with him:—all is one "eternal now." Could we frame to ourselves correct conceptions of this sublime truth, many of the difficulties which result through our present ideas of his foreknowledge, would vanish.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

ABRAHAMIC FAITH.

This seems to be a technical phrase with many at the present day, to designate the doctrine of universal salvation. But, for my part, I consider it vague and inappropriate. I suppose it took its rise from the assertion of St. Paul, (Gal. iii. 8,) that *the Gospel was preached to Abraham*. But is this a sufficient reason for Christians to designate their faith by the name of *Abrahamic*? It is true, we, as Universalists, think that the promise made to Abraham embraces the doctrine of universal salvation by Christ; but it does not appear to me that this offers any reason for christening the doctrine in his name. We also believe, that the promise made to Eve, viz:—that her seed should bruise the serpent's head, embraces the same as that to Abraham. Now, as this was the first promise made to the world of our faith, why not call it after Eve, i. e. the *Eveistic faith*? In short, since the apostle Peter has informed us, that God hath spoken of the restitution of all things, by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began, why not denominate the doctrine by the name of any of the ancient prophets, as well as by Abraham's?

Christians have a far better name by which to designate their faith, than that of Abraham, or any ancient prophet. It is "a name which is above every name;" the name of Him who is "the author and finisher of our faith." Let our faith, then, be denominated the *Christian*, rather than the *Abrahamic*, or any other name given under heaven.

But if the world will have distinctions to designate their particular creeds, let us call ours by a name which is significant and definite, rather than by one which is inappropriate and ambiguous. That the phrase "Abrahamic faith" is ambiguous and liable to be misunderstood, I will refer to an incident which is said to have

LOST, between Stevens' Hotel, and Mr. Gardiner's, a pair of India Rubber Over Shoes. Whoever has found the same, and will return them to this office, shall be suitably rewarded.
Gardiner, Nov. 17.

